UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,260	03/29/2004	Shaun Kazuo Wakumoto	200400253-1	2771

22879 7590 10/09/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
WONG, WARNER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2416	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/812,260	WAKUMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WARNER WONG	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 15-17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bryant (US 2005/0078656) in view of Luo (US 6,377,551).

Regarding claim 1, Bryant describes a method for cost determination for paths between switches in a mesh (fig. 1), comprising:

defining a set of paths between each pair of the mesh switches (para. 38, SPT path routes are calculated for each router/switch);

calculating start-up costs for the paths (para. 36, LSDB contains the calculated lowest-cost metric for the path routes).

recalculating costs for the previously defined paths using a cost protocol (abstract & para. 35, updating (recalculating) routing information comprising cost metric after a delay).

Bryant fails to explicitly describe: the recalculation uses a directed cost protocol.

Luo describes a route computation method comprising: recalculation using a directed cost protocol (fig. 3 step 44, route determination method (protocol) re-evaluates (recalculates) based on a directed graph (directed cost), fig. 17 & col. 8, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to specify that the recalculation of Bryant is performed using a directed cost protocol as in Luo.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that it provides an improved route computation algorithm for communication network (Luo, col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding claim 2, Bryant further describes:

the directed cost protocol comprises generating at a first switch a cost packet with path information associated with a specific path (para. 5, each network node (first switch) advertises (generates) a cost metric associated with each link (path)).

Regarding claim 3, Bryant further describes:

unicasting the cost packet via the specific path to a second switch (para. 6, the generation & propagation (= forwarding) of the link state advertisement packet from one switch/router to another is equivalent to unicasting).

Regarding claim 8, Bryant further describes:

start-up cost packets are flooded through the mesh in order to define the set of paths between each pair of mesh switches and calculate the start-up costs (para. 6, flooding of costs using LSP packets in order to calculate and determine the lowest cost paths between each network node pair).

Regarding claim 9, Bryant describes a mesh network for cost determination for paths between switches in a mesh (fig. 1), comprising:

means for defining a set of paths between each pair of the mesh switches (para. 38, SPT path routes are calculated for each router/switch);

means for calculating start-up costs for the paths (para. 36, LSDB contains the calculated lowest-cost metric for the path routes).

means for recalculating costs for the previously defined paths using a cost protocol (abstract & para. 35, updating (recalculating) routing information comprising cost metric after a delay).

Bryant fails to explicitly describe: the recalculation uses a directed cost protocol.

Luo describes a route computation method comprising: recalculation using a directed cost protocol (fig. 3 step 44, route determination method (protocol) re-evaluates (recalculates) based on a directed graph (directed cost), fig. 17 & col. 8, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to specify that the recalculation of Bryant is performed using a directed cost protocol as in Luo.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that it provides an improved route computation algorithm for communication network (Luo, col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding claim 15, Bryant describes a packet switch apparatus in a switch mesh (fig. 1, routers comprising a mesh network), comprising:

a plurality of ports (fig. 1, each router has ports to other routers);

a switch control device coupled to the plurality of ports (para. 88-89 & fig. 12, processor 144 (switch control device) in a router);

wherein the switch control device is configured to execute cost protocol instructions in order to recalculate costs for previously defined paths (abstract & para. 35, updating (recalculating) routing information comprising cost metric after a delay).

Bryant fails to explicitly describe: the recalculation instructions use a directed cost protocol.

Luo describes a route computation method comprising: recalculation instructions use a directed cost protocol (fig. 3 step 44, route determination method (protocol) re-evaluates (recalculates) based on a directed graph (directed cost), fig. 17 & col. 8, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to specify that the recalculation instructions of Bryant is performed using a directed cost protocol as in Luo.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that it provides an improved route computation algorithm for communication network (Luo, col. 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding claim 16, Bryant further describes:

generate a cost packet with path information associated with a specific path between the packet switch and another mesh switch (para. 5, each network node (first switch) advertises (generates) a cost metric associated with each link (path) to another node).

Regarding claim 17, Bryant further describes:

unicasting the cost packet via the specific path to the other mesh switch (para. 6, the generation & propagation (= forwarding) of the link state advertisement packet from one switch/router to another is equivalent to unicasting).

Regarding claim 20, Bryant further suggests:

perform a flood discovery of paths at long periodic time intervals (para. 6, flooding of costs using LSP packets, propagating the updates in the order of 20 ms [longer] time intervals).

Regarding claim 21, Bryant further describes:

path costs determined by the flood discovery of paths are used to substitute more efficient paths for less efficient paths (para. 6, calculation of shortest path tree substitutes lowest cost paths (more efficient paths) for higher cost paths (less efficient paths)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 4-6 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryant in view of Luo as applied to claims 3 and 17 above respectively, and further in view of Kelsey (US 2005/0249215).

Regarding claim 4, Bryant fails to describe that the intermediate switches along the specific path each add cost information to the cost packet prior to forwarding the cost packet to a next switch along the specific path.

Kelsey describes that intermediate switches along the specific path each add cost information to the cost packet prior to forwarding the cost packet to a next switch along the specific path (fig. 2 & para. 52, intermediate nodes B & C increment the accrued cost field 228 within the unicast message 220A).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to specify that the intermediate switches along the specific path add cost information of the cost packet as in Kelsey for the cost packets in Bryant and Luo combined.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that such protocol with cost packet comprising an accrue cost field results is a more efficient routing (Kelsey, para. 31).

Regarding claim 5, Bryant further describes:

repeating the recalculation at periodic intervals (abstract & para. 35, updating (recalculating) routing information comprising cost metric after a delay).

Regarding claim 6, Bryant describes the use of cost packets, but fails to describe that the cost packet piggybacking information for more than one path.

Kelsey describes:

piggybacking information for more than one path into a packet (fig. 2 &para. 101, use of source routing comprises appending (piggybacking) each intermediate routing information to the cost-related packet 220B from source to destination).

Regarding claim 18, Bryant further describes:

repeating the recalculation at periodic intervals (abstract & para. 35, updating (recalculating) routing information comprising cost metric after a delay).

Regarding claim 19, Bryant describes the use of cost packets, but fails to describe that the cost packet piggybacking information for more than one path.

Kelsey describes:

piggybacking information for more than one path into a packet (fig. 2 &para. 101, use of source routing comprises appending (piggybacking) each intermediate routing information to the cost-related packet 220B from source to destination).

3. Claims 7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryant and Luo as applied to claims 1 and 9 above respectively, and further in view of Erhart (US 20050068941).

Regarding claim 7, Bryant fails to describe: previously defined paths are identified by path tags inserted into packets sent between the mesh switches.

Erhart describes: previously defined paths are identified by path tags inserted into packets sent between the mesh switches (Erhart, para. 10, using Multiprotocol Label Switching network comprises labels (path tags) for each transmission packet).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant in using a communication scheme with a MPLS-based network as in Erhart for network communication in Bryant and Luo.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that it leads to an increase of quality of service in a packet-switched network (para. 6).

Regarding claim 10, Bryant further describes:

start-up cost packets are flooded through the mesh in order to define the set of paths between each pair of mesh switches and calculate the start-up costs (para. 6, flooding of costs using LSP packets in order to calculate and determine the lowest cost paths between each network node pair), but fails to describe:

previously defined paths are identified by path tags inserted into packets sent between the mesh switches.

Erhart describes: previously defined paths are identified by path tags inserted into packets sent between the mesh switches (Erhart, para. 10, using Multiprotocol Label Switching network comprises labels (path tags) for each transmission packet).

Regarding claim 11, Bryant further describes:

repeating the recalculation at periodic intervals (abstract & para. 35, updating (recalculating) routing information comprising cost metric after a delay).

4. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryant in view of Luo and Erhart as applied to claim 11, and further in view of Kelsey.

Regarding claim 12, Bryant and Erhart combined describe the use of cost packet, but fail to describe:

generation at a destination switch a cost protocol comprises generation at a destination switch a cost packet with path information associated with a specific path

that begins at a source switch and ends at the destination switch and unicast transmission of the cost packet via the specific path to the source switch.

Kelsey describes:

generation at a destination switch a cost protocol comprises generation at a destination switch a cost packet with path information associated with a specific path that begins at a source switch and ends at the destination switch and unicast transmission of the cost packet via the specific path to the source switch (para. 101, source routing comprises generation of cost-related packet similar to fig. 2 220A at the destination router/switch along with the entire source route comprising intermediate routing information back to the source router/switch).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to specify the use of source routing using the cost packet as in Kelsey for the cost packets in the combined teachings of Bryant, Luo and Erhart.

The motivation for combining the teachings is that such protocol with cost packet comprising an accrue cost field results is a more efficient routing (Kelsey, para. 31).

Regarding claim 13, Bryant, Luo, Erhart and Kelsey combined further describe:

the intermediate switches along the specific path each add cost information to the cost packet prior to forwarding the cost packet to a next switch along the specific path (Kelsey, fig. 2 & para. 52, intermediate nodes B & C increment the accrued cost field 228 within the unicast message 220A).

Regarding claim 14, Bryant, Luo, Erhart and Kelsey combined further describe:

piggybacking information for more than one path into a packet (Kelsey, fig. 2 &para. 101, use of source routing comprises appending (piggybacking) each intermediate routing information to the cost-related packet 220B from source to destination).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Zhang (US 7,400,589) describing a method for deriving optimal paths through a network and Ravindran (US 7,382,738) describing method for computing metric information fro abstracted network links.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WARNER WONG whose telephone number is (571)272-8197. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30AM - 3:00PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kwang Yao can be reached on 571-272-3182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Warner Wong
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

/W. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2616

/Kwang B. Yao/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616